DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 067 CE 047 906

AUTHOR Bailis, Lawrence Neil
TITLE Community-Based Organizations and Vocational Education: The Path to Partnership. Information Series No. 319.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 87
GRANT G008620030
NOTE 48p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center Publications, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210-1090 (Order No. IN319--$6.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Coordination; *Community Organizations; *Cooperative Programs; Demonstration Programs; Educational Benefits; Futures (of Society); Models; *Organizational Effectiveness; Organizational Objectives; Postsecondary Education; *Prevocational Education; *School Community Programs; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Carl D Perkins Vocational Education Act 1984

ABSTRACT

Community-based organizations (CBOs) have been an integral part of the employment and training programs of the past two decades and have provided a wide variety of services to youth and adults alike. The vast differences between different CBOs make it impossible to draw definitive, generalizable conclusions about them. It appears, however, that partnerships between school systems and CBOs (particularly in the area of prevocational education and supportive services) can reattract to the system people who might otherwise have given up and can provide disadvantaged youth and adults the fundamental and basic skills needed to succeed in secondary and postsecondary programs. The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act has laid the foundation and provided the funding for new partnerships between CBOs and vocational education. Technical barriers to coordination can be overcome by adopting longer-range planning horizons, face-to-face meetings between vocational educators and CBO staff (to eliminate false stereotypes), developing suitable accountability procedures, and contracting with CBOs that have demonstrated the ability to manage and account for funds. A variety of program models are possible, including vocational orientation and counseling, remedial education, career education in an alternative high school setting, employment and work experience programs, and combined/comprehensive programs. (Models of 10 exemplary programs and sources of information about specific CBOs are appended.) (MN)

ED284067

Information Series No. 319

COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: THE PATH TO PARTNERSHIP

Lawrence Neil Bailis
Center for Human Resources
Brandeis University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

CE047906

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090

1987

THE NATIONAL CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The National Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Providing information for national planning and policy
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

For further information contact:

Program Information Office
National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090

Telephone: (614) 486-3655 or (800) 848-4815
Cable: CTVOCEDOSU/Columbus, Ohio
Telex: 8104821894

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title:	National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Clearinghouse
Grant Number:	G008620030
Project Number:	051BH600001A
Act under Which Funds Administered:	Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, P.L. 98-524, 1984
Source of Grant:	Office of Vocational and Adult Education U.S. Department of Education Washington, D.C. 20202
Grantee:	The National Center for Research in Vocational Education The Ohio State University 1960 Kenny Road Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090
Acting Executive Director:	Chester K. Hansen
Disclaimer:	This publication was prepared pursuant to a grant with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Grantees undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy.
Discrimination Prohibited:	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education Project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES v

FOREWORD vii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ix

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW 1

BACKGROUND: WHAT ARE CBOs AND WHAT DO THEY DO? 5

- The Expanding Umbrella 5
- Limited Progress in CBO-Public School Coordination 7
- The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act 9
- The Rationale for Using CBOs 10
- Comparing Rhetoric and Reality 11

CBO INVOLVEMENT IN PREVOCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS: PATTERNS AND TRENDS 13

- Introduction and Overview 13
- Conflicting Conclusions about Trends in Overall Utilization of CBOs 14
- Causes of Changing Utilization of CBOs 17
- Functions of CBOs 18

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE 21

- Contributions that CBOs Can Make 21
- Barriers to Partnerships with CBOs and Strategies to Overcome Them 22
- Future Prospects 25

APPENDICES

- A: Exemplary Program Models 27
- B: Sources of Information About Specific Community-Based Organizations 37

REFERENCES 41

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. TRAINING CONTRACTS IN SAN DIEGO SDA BY TYPE OF AGENCY 17

2. PROPORTION OF COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING SPECIFIC SERVICES 20

FOREWORD

Community-based organizations (CBOs) have a strong tradition of providing effective vocational services to disadvantaged youth and adults. Educators should be aware of these services in order to better serve the needs of these special populations through increased coordination of schools, CBOs, and business and industry. This paper should be of interest to administrators in both schools and CBOs, as well as teachers, state and local agency personnel, and members of the business community.

The profession is indebted to Dr. Lawrence Neil Bailis for his scholarship in preparing this paper. Dr. Bailis is Senior Research Associate, Center for Human Resources, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University. He is also Adjunct Assistant Professor, Boston University School of Social Work, has taught at several universities, and has served as a consultant to numerous agencies and organizations.

The National Center wishes to acknowledge the leadership provided to this effort by Dr. Robert E. Taylor, recently retired Executive Director. Karen S. Dawson, a private consultant; Dr. Jacqueline Spears of the Action Agency for Postsecondary Rural Education, Kansas State University; and Dr. William Ashley, Research Specialist 2, and Dr. Dewey Adams, Senior Research Specialist, of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, contributed to the development of the paper through their critical reviews of the manuscript. Dr. Wesley E. Budke, Senior Research Specialist, coordinated the publication's development, assisted by Ruth Gordon and Sandra Kerka, Program Associates, and Laurian Miguel, Program Assistant. Clarine Cotton, Marjorie Dellinger, Jean Messick, Sally Robinson, and Sarah Guda provided clerical support, and Janet Ray served as word processor operator. Ciritta Park of the National Center's Editorial Services edited the paper.

The author wishes to thank Lawrence Brown, President, 70001 Training and Employment Institute, for his assistance in collecting information about exemplary programs.

Chester K. Hansen
Acting Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Educators' awareness of the potential of private, nonprofit grassroots organizations in attracting and serving disadvantaged youth and adults is necessary for effective collaboration between these community-based organizations (CBOs) and schools. This publication helps clarify the role of CBOs in vocational education by explaining what CBOs are, summarizing the role they have played in employment and training programs in the past, and outlining the future prospects for coordination between the mainstream vocational education system and CBOs.

Conclusions presented about CBO involvement are as follows:

- CBOs have been an integral part of the employment and training programs of the past two decades and have provided a wide variety of services to both youth and adults.
- Funding for CBOs has been provided because these groups have been judged to be especially effective in reaching and serving hard-to-place clients.
- Vast differences in CBOs--their types, the services they offer, and their apparent effectiveness--and the state of the research literature make it impossible to draw definitive generalizations about the specific circumstances under which CBOs can be expected to provide unique advantages in vocational and/or prevocational education.
- Because CBOs have provided a wide range of exemplary services to many disadvantaged youth and adults in many settings, vocational education professionals who seek to serve these hard-to-serve groups should consider carefully the potential benefits of coordinating cooperative activities with the specific CBOs in their jurisdictions.

Materials summarized in this paper suggest that the advantage of CBOs over school systems may lie in prevocational services. Mutual benefits derive from services such as the following:

- Attracting students not being served in vocational education programs
- Assessing students' needs
- Providing remediation that will raise students' educational and motivational levels to enable them to benefit from traditional secondary and postsecondary vocational training programs

Means are suggested for overcoming barriers to developing partnerships with CBOs. Delays in implementing the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act present one such barrier. Funds become available to local education agencies only after budgets have been finalized. As with past legislation, this problem might be alleviated when funds have been appropriated and allocated. Information about CBOs in any locality and how to contact them can be obtained from a variety of sources in order to overcome school officials' lack of knowledge about community groups. Names and addresses of contact persons for the following agencies are in appendix B:

- The National Youth Employment Coalition and its nationwide affiliates
- The Center for Community Change
- The national headquarters of CBOs
- State and local client advocacy organizations
- State and local agencies funded through the Job Training Partnership Act

Technical barriers to coordination, such as different funding cycles for schools and CBOs, can be overcome by adoption of longer-run planning horizons. Staff of school systems and CBOs often hold different perspectives and have a tradition of distrust and lack of understanding. Careful efforts to work together are likely, over time, to overcome false stereotypes and to bring about changes. Finally, concerns about CBO accountability can be addressed by limiting contracting to CBOs that have demonstrated ability to manage and account for funds, by working with CBOs to develop suitable procedures, or by using intermediary organizations or other contracting arrangements that can meet the requirements imposed by school system accounting departments.

Partnerships between school systems and CBOs can attract back to the system people who might otherwise have given up and can provide disadvantaged youth and adults the fundamental and basic skills needed to succeed in secondary and postsecondary programs. Fulfilling this theoretical prospect requires that potential partners get to know each other and develop working relationships based on mutual trust and mutual ability to deliver. Because of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, the framework for closer cooperation is in place, and funding is available to support new initiatives throughout the country. Schools and CBOs now must recognize their mutual interests and work together to translate them into programs that improve access to quality vocational education for many previously excluded groups.

Program models are presented in appendix A to provide an indication of the range of expertise that community groups have and can bring to partnerships with public vocational education agencies. They exemplify six foci:

- Vocational orientation and counseling
- Remedial education
- Career education in an alternative high school setting
- Employment and work experience programs
- Combined/comprehensive programs
- Innovative approaches

Each example includes a statement of the focus, identification of the sponsoring organization, and a program description.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Vocational education researchers and practitioners have long been aware of problems in ensuring equal access to all groups in society. Some analyses focus on ethnic minorities. For example, the final report of the *Vocational Education Study* (1981) concluded that "minorities in most States enrolled in secondary vocational education programs in lower relative proportions than nonminority students" (p. III-5). *A Vocational Policy for the 1980s* by the National Council on Employment Policy (1982) came to a similar conclusion:

> Minorities take less vocational education than comparable whites . . . Some schools continue to discriminate against blacks. Very few vocational educators speak a second language, so they are not ready for the rapid increase in students with limited English speaking ability. (p. 11)

Other studies address the failure of vocational programs to meet the needs of high school dropouts. For example, the recently published *Youth Employment and Training Programs: The YEDPA Years* (Betsey, Hollister, and Papageorgiou 1985) notes the following:

> Though it is widely recognized that of all youth employment problems, those of school dropouts are the most serious, there appears to be a tendency of employment and training programs to avoid serving this group. Many programs designed specifically to serve dropouts (either through school-conditioned work or through alternative education, training, or work settings) often had difficulties recruiting them and, once they were recruited, experienced difficulties retaining them in the program. (p. 8)

Improved access for disadvantaged students has been cited as a key objective of many of the major legislative reform proposals for vocational education in the early 1980s. The Reagan administration's proposed amendments to the Vocational Education Act (H.R. 4793) called for promoting "equal educational opportunity in vocational education for all students, including those with special needs such as the handicapped, the educationally disadvantaged, and those with limited English proficiency." (U.S. Congress 1984b)

The *Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act* of 1984 (P.L. 98-254) more strongly expressed this same purpose thus:

> To . . . assure that individuals who are inadequately served under vocational education programs are assured access to quality vocational education programs, especially individuals who are disadvantaged, who are handicapped, men and women who are entering nontraditional occupations, adults who are in need of training and retraining, individuals who are single parents or homemakers, individuals with limited English proficiency, and individuals who are incarcerated in correctional institutions.

In recent years, vocational educators in public and private settings have adopted a wide range of strategies to deal with the problems of equal access. Many of them center on what might be called an *in-house approach*, such as efforts to restructure and revise their existing offerings and

curricula in order to make them more responsive to the needs of disadvantaged youth and others with special needs. This paper addresses another way to proceed—a *collaborative approach* built upon partnerships between schools and the private, nonprofit grassroots organizations commonly known as neighborhood and community-based organizations (CBOs).

As is discussed in greater detail in the remainder of this paper, community-based organizations have demonstrated unique strengths in attracting and serving disadvantaged youth. In theory, there are clear benefits to public secondary and postsecondary institutions who enter into partnerships with CBOs in order to counterbalance weaknesses in current programs. For example, CBOs can sometimes help provide the prevocational services that enable disadvantaged youth to participate in vocational education offerings designed for a more general audience; CBOs can also often provide assistance in placement of disadvantaged youth at the end of vocational education programs.

However, as all educators are aware, theory is one thing and practice is another. Productive partnerships between community groups and school systems have tended to be the exception rather than the rule. Supporters of community-based organizations have been advocating closer coordination between their groups and school systems for years, and provisions to promote coordination have been incorporated into much of the employment and training legislation of the 1970s and 1980s. Yet, as noted by Campbell-Thrane and Jahnke (1981), the results have been sporadic at best.

The passage of the Carl D. Perkins Act has provided new impetus for efforts to promote this kind of coordination. In particular, in its efforts to increase the access to vocational education for students who traditionally have been underserved, Title III, Part A of the act requires states to provide financial assistance to joint programs of eligible Title I recipients and CBOs for the conduct of outreach, transitional, and prevocational efforts and authorizes funding for this purpose.

Due to the limited amount of time that has passed since the enactment of this law, it is not possible to make definitive judgments on its success. However, some concerns have already surfaced. Despite the obvious potential that this approach holds, some educators remain unaware of what CBOs can do and the benefits that can result from productive partnerships between schools and these community groups. Moreover, efforts to promote partnership have often become bogged down over procedural or substantive problems.

This monograph has been prepared in order to help vocational education professionals in public secondary and postsecondary school systems to overcome these problems in several ways. First, it deals with information gaps by explaining what CBOs are, summarizing the role that they have played in employment and training programs in the past, and outlining the potential roles they can play in partnerships with vocational education programs in the future. Then it addresses some of the problems that have been faced in creating partnerships and suggests steps that can be taken to help overcome them.

The monograph is based primarily on a thorough review of the vocational education and broader employment and training research literature. Other sources have included information about exemplary programs operated by CBOs that were provided by members of the National Youth Employment Coalition* (NYEC) and conversations with officials of several leading community-based organizations.

*The members of the NYEC were provided with a summary of the plans for the research study that resulted in this monograph and were requested to provide descriptive materials to the author. These materials were then screened according to several criteria including apparent innovativeness, relevance to the purpose of the study, and potential interest to readers of the monograph.

The overall conclusions that can be drawn from this information can be summarized as follows:

- Community-based organizations have been an integral part of the employment and training programs of the past two decades and have provided a wide variety of services to both youth and adults.

- Funding for community-based organizations has been based on the judgment that these groups have unique advantages in reaching and serving hard-to-place clients.

- The vast differences in types of organizations that call themselves CBOs, in the services they offer, and in their apparent effectiveness, and the current state of the research literature make it impossible to draw definitive generalizations about the specific circumstances under which CBOs can be expected to provide unique advantages in vocational and/or prevocational education.

- However, community-based organizations have clearly provided a wide range of exemplary services to many disadvantaged youth and adults in many settings. Therefore, vocational education professionals who seek to reach out to these hard-to-serve groups should carefully consider the potential benefits that can come from partnerships with the specific CBOs within their jurisdictions.

The remainder of the paper consists of discussions of the following:

- The history and background of the nation's CBOs and the rationale for increasing their involvement in vocational education

- A review of the literature on the role that CBOs have played in vocational education and related employment and training programs

- Conclusions about steps that can be taken to foster continued and growing cooperation

Examples of innovative programs offered by CBOs, including successful partnerships between schools and community-based organizations, are included in appendix A.

BACKGROUND: WHAT ARE CBOS AND WHAT DO THEY DO?

Analyses of the role of community-based organizations (CBOs) in vocational education and related employment and training programs have often been complicated by misunderstandings about what these groups really are, the reasons that they have been created, and their strengths in terms of serving disadvantaged youth and adults. Each of these issues is addressed below.

The Expanding Umbrella

In the mid-1980s, people often use the term "community-based organization" to refer to any nonprofit organization that claims to be "serving the community"; the term thus encompasses minority advocacy groups, business associations, and community-wide groups such as the Young Women's Christian Associations (YWCAs).

However, the term was used considerably more restrictively when it first came into use in the 1960s.* Initially, the term CBO was only applied to private nonprofit organizations that claimed to represent ethnic minority and other low income groups, to be run by representatives of these groups, and to be orienting their services to meet the needs of disadvantaged Americans. Some people still tend to use the term rather narrowly. See, for example, the definition used in Poulard (1983):

> The thousands of grass roots, neighborhood-based organizations that are established by and/or for poor and minority individuals in order to provide a service or advocate an issue related to their needs . . .
>
> The CBOs are incorporated and have democratic elected boards of policy-makers, who legitimately represent the clientele they serve. (p. 1)

Although some of the CBOs of the 1960s had been in existence for decades, most were created in response to the expansion of federal funding for employment and training programs brought about by the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA), the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (EOA), and the subsequent amendments to these laws.

Both the newer community-based groups, such as local affiliates of the black-oriented Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OICs) and Hispanic-oriented Jobs for Progress (Project SER), and older groups, such as the affiliates of the National Urban League (NUL), have been created and/or chosen to enter into the employment and training arena in order to help fill in gaps created by the failure of public organizations such as the Employment Service and public schools to meet the needs of their disadvantaged youth and adults. Many leaders of these early

---

*The evolution of the term "CBO" is discussed in considerably greater detail in Howard Hallman's (1980) *Community-based Employment Programs* and several other sources listed in the References.

CBOs thus came to think of their organizations as alternatives to these mainstream public agencies.

In the 1970s, changes in the way that employment and training programs were funded made it advantageous for more and more organizations to call themselves CBOs. Under MDTA and EOA, the local affiliates of OIC, SER, and NUL and local community action agencies (CAAs or CAP programs) were directly funded through contracts with federal agencies such as the U.S. Department of Labor.

Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA), most federal funding for what were then called "manpower programs" was shifted from individual service deliverers to general purpose local governments. For the most part, these local governments (called Prime Sponsors) were given the freedom to select the types of programs that they wished to fund and the types of service deliverers that they believed would be most effective. The Prime Sponsors, who were usually cities, counties, or groups of cities or counties, were authorized to deliver services themselves, or to subcontract with such types of deliverers as the Employment Service, schools, and community-based organizations.

However, in recognition of the track record that CBOs had already developed in serving disadvantaged Americans, the CETA legislation and regulations also included a variety of provisions that were designed to encourage the utilization of community groups. The initial legislation required that "due consideration" be given to "community based organizations of demonstrated effectiveness" and the accompanying regulations explicitly listed the five groups (OIC, SER, NUL, CAAs as well as Operation Mainstream, a national organization whose affiliates specialized in the provision of providing community service employment to senior citizens).

Due in part to the fact that CETA and the subsequent Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA) gave special funding priority to CBOs, an increasing number of groups sought to be included under the CBO "umbrella" during the 1970s.* Some of these groups also had roots in ethnic communities such as the National Puerto Rican Forum, but others had a low income neighborhood rather than an ethnic orientation, and still others claimed to represent the "community at large" rather than an ethnic or low income segment.

These efforts to broaden the meaning of the term "CBO" were ratified in the 1978 amendments to CETA, and by the end of the decade the term CBO was broad enough to include virtually any nonprofit organization. According to these amendments:

> The term "community-based organizations" means private nonprofit organizations which are representative of communities or significant segments of communities and which provide employment and training services (for example, Opportunities Industrialization Centers, National Urban League, SER-Jobs for Progress, United Way of America, Mainstream, and National Puerto Rican Forum, neighborhood groups and organizations, vocational rehabilitation organizations, rehabilitation facilities, agencies serving youth, union-related organizations, and employer-related organizations).

Thus, by the 1980s, Urban League affiliates were joined by Future Homemakers of America under the expanding CBO umbrella, and advocacy groups for low-income Hispanics found them-

*One of the YEDPA programs went even further than requirements to give "special consideration" by noting that first preference was to be given to CBOs, while non-CBOs could only be funded when applications from CBOs were deficient.

selves in the same CBO coalition as the Young Men's Christian Associations (YMCAs of America) and chambers of commerce. The expansion of the term "community group" undoubtedly resulted in a broader political base, but greatly complicates efforts to generalize about what CBOs are and what they do.

Limited Progress in CBO-Public School Coordination

On paper, there are numerous reasons why community groups and public schools could better serve disadvantaged clients by working together. CBOs are said to have "roots" in disadvantaged communities that enable them to reach out to and attract high school dropouts and potential dropouts, youth and adults with limited English-speaking ability, and other hard-to-serve men and women. However, they also often have limited funding, outdated equipment, and problems in implementing complex fiscal requirements. School systems, on the other hand, have had decades of experience in curriculum development, highly credentialized staff, and a vastly richer and stable resource base with which to plan and implement programs. At the same time, many school systems lack credibility in the eyes of the disadvantaged youth whom they seek to serve. It would thus appear that creative partnerships between CBOs and schools have the potential to blend together the strengths of each partner and overcome their shortcomings.

Moreover, during most of the 1970s and early 1980s, the employment and training legislation encouraged the creation of such partnerships by promoting coordination between CETA and the vocational education system. The mechanisms to promote coordination included set-asides of funding for coordinated projects and federally funded training and technical assistance efforts to promote mutual understanding and cooperation.

However, neither the theoretical advantages nor institutional incentives were sufficient to promote wide-scale collaboration between the CBOs funded by CETA and public school systems. Productive partnerships were sometimes initiated, but they tended to be the exception rather than the rule.

Efforts to promote coordination between CBOs and other CETA service deliverers on the one hand, and school systems on the other, were hampered by a variety of factors. Some of them were technical. For example, the CETA and vocational education planning and funding cycles were different, and different government bodies were involved in funding programs—state governments played a key role in vocational education and a limited one in CETA (except in the most rural parts of the state.)

Other problems dealt more with perceptions and lack of knowledge. For example, leaders of CBOs and schools often differed in their assessments of the effectiveness of ongoing vocational education offerings, and school administrators often viewed CETA as an ever-changing program that was not stable enough to warrant long-term planning for coordination.

In many communities the leaders of CBOs and school administrators simply did not believe that they could benefit by working together. The CBOs that were funded under CETA were often wary of collaborating with the mainstream organizations that, in their opinion, had failed to serve disadvantaged students adequately in the first place, were insufficiently committed to serving them even now, and were unaware that they needed help. School administrators, in turn, were often unaware of what CBOs were doing, how they could contribute to upgrading services, or how they could be relevant or fiscally accountable to them.

The CETA and vocational education research literature of the period thus tends to document isolated examples of successful coordination along with broader conclusions of "room for improvement." For example, a 1983 survey of 50 CETA Prime Sponsors conducted for the National Commission for Employment Policy (Bailis 1984b) indicated that only one Prime Sponsor out of eight had formal client referral agreements between its service deliverers and the vocational education system, and fewer than one in five engaged in any joint funding.

Perhaps the greatest progress in linking school systems and the CBOs and other service deliverers within the employment and training programs of the 1970s was accomplished under the Youth Education and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA). As noted in Hahn et al. (1983), the YEDPA Youth Education and Training Program (YETP) program had a set-aside of 22 percent of program funds that had to be spent on in-school youth, and this provision resulted in some progress in getting schools and CETA service deliverers to work together:

> Linking employment and training monies to the requirements for formal agreements between CETA Prime Sponsors and local education agencies almost invariably resulted in the creation (or enhancement) of such agreements. (p. 484)
>
> All but one of the forty-nine Prime Sponsors surveyed by the GAO [in a September 1982 study entitled *Insights into CETA's In School Youth Programs*] . . . were able to document such agreements. . . . This statistic compares with the 37 percent of Prime Sponsors surveyed that reported written agreements with local education agencies for their Title IIBC [CETA] programs where agreements were *not* required. (p. 485)
>
> [The set-aside] . . . has produced tangible results in overcoming much of the inertia that has characterized efforts to bring about change in school systems. (p. 486)

However, even Hahn and his colleagues conclude that the set-asides did not have the kind of impact that adherents for closer ties between training agencies and schools had hoped for:

> The lessons of the . . . set-aside include the fact that this mechanism was not sufficient to promote more fundamental change in local education agencies. In particular, the evidence of the past few years suggests that YETP did not generally promote the development of new basic education programs that were targeted on the special needs of disadvantaged youth. . . .
>
> [According to a 1981 study by Syracuse Research Corporation] the most perceptive analyses of the results of CETA/education coordination efforts seem to agree: at the service delivery level, only little progress was made. The many mandated set-asides, sign-offs, and interlocking council members had been implemented, as had been a series of demonstration projects stressing collaboration. But their effects have not been strongly felt "at the point where services pass from the provider to the recipient." (p. 487)

The enactment of the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 (JTPA) brought about a wide variety of changes in the federally funded employment and training system, but none appear to have had any significant impact on coordination between community groups and school systems. Under JTPA, state governments have replaced the U.S. Department of Labor as the key actor in providing federal funding and overseeing local operations in jurisdictions that are now called Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). The local governments in these SDAs now share the planning and oversight role with the business community that represents the majority of members on the JTPA governing boards called Private Industry Councils (PICs). Service Delivery Areas are now held

accountable for the attainment of specific performance standards related to placements in jobs; SDAs that perform well are to be rewarded with incentive payments and those with low performance face transfer of program responsibility to another entity. Furthermore, in order to obtain funding, both states and localities are required to adopt detailed plans for coordination of a wide variety of services.

The emerging JTPA implementation literature is beginning to document the impact of these changes on the local level service delivery systems. However, it appears that the progress in improving coordination between the CBOs (and other agencies funded by Service Delivery Areas) and school systems has been slower than many had hoped for (Bailis 1987b).

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act

The 1984 enactment of the *Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act* (PL 98-524) represents a watershed in the efforts to bring about productive partnerships between the mainstream vocational education system and community-based organizations. Previous set-asides were focused on the CETA and JTPA service delivery system, were well-known in the system, and gave providers incentives to reach out to school systems. The Perkins Act provides symmetry, by setting aside *education* funding, capturing the attention of school administrators, and providing incentives to school systems to do the reaching out by providing funds that are available through channels with which schools are familiar.

Title III, Part A of the Act provides a specific mechanism to promote partnerships that increase access to the vocational education system for students who have traditionally been underserved. In particular, it requires states to provide financial assistance to joint programs of eligible Title I recipients and CBOs for the conduct of services such as these:

- Outreach programs to facilitate the entrance of youth into a program of transitional services and subsequent entrance into vocational education, employment, or other education and training
- Transitional services such as attitudinal and motivational prevocational training programs
- Prevocational educational preparation and basic skills development conducted in cooperation with business concerns
- Special prevocational preparation programs targeted to inner city youth, non-English speaking youth, Appalachian youth, and the youth of other impoverished urban and rural areas having a high density of poverty who need special prevocational education programs
- Career intern programs
- Assessment of student needs in relation to vocational education and jobs
- Guidance and counseling to assist students with occupational choices and with the selection of a vocational education program.

The intent of Congress seems clear. Ideally, school systems would develop partnerships in which community groups were responsible for recruiting disadvantaged dropouts and those at risk

of dropping out, and then provide them with the kind of prevocational training that would enable them to take full advantage of "mainstream" vocational education programs already established in school systems.

What reason would schools have for turning to CBOs to provide these prevocational services? And how likely is it that CBOs could meet these expectations? The first of these questions is addressed in the remainder of this chapter; the latter is addressed in the following two chapters.

The Rationale for Using CBOs

The supporters of CBOs advance a wide range of reasons for their being uniquely situated to provide services to disadvantaged youth and adults. As is illustrated in the following excerpt from an Urban Coalition publication, these rationales generally revolve around the fact that CBOs are "closer to the clients" than are mainstream institutions such as schools or the Employment Service:

> Many community organizations have a long history of operating employment and training programs. Often they are the best organizations for running such programs because they usually have close ties to the community groups—such as welfare recipients and minorities—that [employment and training programs are] serving. Also they may be able to start a program more quickly than the educational system can. . . .
>
> With their commitment to improving the availability of jobs and training for urban minorities and disadvantaged people, community-based organizations and neighborhood groups have a stake in making sure that vocational education programs in urban areas are available and responsive to local needs. (Lydecker 1980, pp. 5, 20)

Moreover, the stated rationale for utilizing CBOs to reach disadvantaged youth and adults goes beyond the kinds of generalities in the previous paragraphs by addressing the supposed comparative advantages of community groups for many key prevocational functions. The most commonly used arguments are summarized below.

Outreach and Recruitment

CBOs have often been employed in efforts to reach out to groups that are not adequately served by mainstream organizations. Rationales for doing so have included both their physical location in the neighborhoods in which disadvantaged youth and adults live and their rapport with these potential clients. These arguments have often been buttressed by the fact that CBOs are often staffed by men and women whose backgrounds are similar to those of the client pool. CBOs are said to relate better to their clients, and clients are said to be more likely to trust representatives of CBOs.

Intake and Assessment

It is often argued that standard assessment tools and techniques are geared to mainstream youth and adults and are not effective in determining the true strengths, weaknesses, and interests of disadvantaged youth and adults. Supporters of community groups argue that the rapport between staff of their agencies and clients more than compensates for the fact that CBOs are often

forced to rely on less sophisticated assessment procedures and techniques than those employed by school systems and other employment and training agencies. As a result, they say that CBO staff are more likely to put together meaningful employability development plans for disadvantaged clients.

Counseling and Career Guidance

As in the case of assessment, advocates of involvement of CBOs often stress the key role of developing and maintaining rapport with clients in the conduct of successful counseling. CBO staff are said to be in a better position to "know where clients are coming from," and hence to develop a personal tie that sparks openness on the part of clients and an ability to communicate on the part of the agency staff members.

Motivational Programs

It is often said that the CBO staff understanding of client background makes them an especially valuable resource in developing and implementing motivationally oriented prevocational training efforts. The closeness to clients is thus translated into an understanding of what the motivational problems might be and how to combat them in language that is meaningful to disadvantaged clients.

Comparing Rhetoric and Reality

The arguments presented here have what researchers call "face validity," i.e., they seem reasonable. However, do they have a basis in reality? Despite the considerable amounts of research that have been done on vocational education and other employment and training programs, there has been only limited progress in providing empirical evidence to back up, or to question, the preceding rationales for using CBOs.

For the most part, the jury is still out. Some research findings indicate that the personal qualities of vocational education instructors are very important in obtaining positive outcomes for disadvantaged students. A study by Contemporary Research, Inc. (1974) of staffing patterns in 14 vocational education programs that "appeared to have some success in attracting, retaining, and training ethnic minority students" concluded the following:

- Staff expectations and concern for students are the factors that have the greatest impact, both positively and negatively, on student motivation.
- The program staff's ethnic mix and balance is an extremely important factor in that it heavily influences student motivational levels.
- The closer the match between student and staff backgrounds, the greater the success of the program.

However, the available research is far from definitive on this topic. Many people believe that CBO staff tend to develop better rapport with disadvantaged students than do the staff of school systems and other "mainstream" agencies. There is anecdotal and case study data to support this point of view, but no empirical basis for accepting or rejecting the hypothesis that says this pattern always holds.

More generally, the research does not enable us to "reality test" most of the claims for CBOs that are contained in this monograph. Comprehensive studies on this topic have not been conducted*, and even if they were, they would be of limited use in program planning at the local level. As is stressed at several points in this monograph, there are such wide variations in the nature and effectiveness of individual CBOs that it would be quite risky for public school administrators to decide to enter into (or forego entering into) a partnership with a given community group on the basis of analyses of the average or typical CBO in a nationwide sample.

Despite these shortcomings, the published research can provide considerable insights into the roles that individual CBOs can potentially play by reviewing the roles that CBOs have played in the past and the way that these roles have been changing over time. This research is summarized in the following chapter.

*The nationwide studies of CETA and JTPA (e.g., the studies conducted by Cook et al. for Westat, and the studies conducted by Walker et al. for Grinker-Walker and Associates) have all used the Prime Sponsor or Service Delivery Area as their primary unit of analysis, and do not provide a thorough systematic analysis of the implications of using specific types of service deliverers.

CBO INVOLVEMENT IN PREVOCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS: PATTERNS AND TRENDS

Introduction and Overview

The following factors make it difficult to generalize about the involvement of community-based organizations in the vocational education and related employment and training systems of the past two decades:

- Lack of definitive data on outcomes of programs using different types of service deliverers
- The wide variation in CBO activities and apparent effectiveness from locale to locale and within individual locales

While data on the *outcomes* of individual vocational education or employment and training programs are often available, there are relatively few definitive studies about the long-term *impact* of these programs on clients' long run future employment prospects. Mertens et al. (1980) reviewed the results of 232 studies of vocational education programs and concluded that "insufficient data were reported on occupational skill attainment to draw any conclusions" (p. xiii). The U.S. Department of Labor is now engaged in a multimillion dollar experiment to determine the overall impacts of JTPA, in large part because it concluded that it was impossible to arrive at unambiguous conclusions about the impact of CETA because of weaknesses in the study designs for all of the major studies of that program (Cook et al. 1985b).

Given this situation it is not surprising to learn that there have been no methodologically sophisticated studies of the impact of using different types of service deliverers in such programs, e.g., the impact of using community-based organizations to deliver prevocational or vocational services as opposed to using schools or other "mainstream" service deliverers for this purpose.*

The published research literature does, however, suggest that the utilization of community groups and the apparent results of using them have varied considerably under both the CETA and JTPA programs. Some local sponsors have allotted all of their vocational and prevocational training funds to community groups while others relied primarily on public agencies. Some community groups have become established in their communities and others have been tarnished by financial scandals and disappeared. For example, the final volume in a 3-year study of the initial implementation of JTPA concluded the following:

*The difficulties that one encounters in conducting such an analysis are summarized in Bailis (1984a).

> The role of CBOs . . . varies considerably across States and their SDAs. In some jurisdictions, CBOs remain the principal providers of JTPA services; in others, their existence is in jeopardy. (Cook et al. 1985b, p. 3-8)

Both of these factors imply that vocational education planners must move beyond the rhetoric and national reputations of CBOs if they wish to understand what a particular CBO can do in a particular community. In order to provide an understanding of the potential role that CBOs can play, this chapter summarizes the available literature about the roles that CBOs have played under CETA and JTPA. Appendix A provides further insights on this topic issue by presenting specific examples of well-regarded program models that have been implemented by community groups in the recent past.

Conflicting Conclusions about Trends in Overall Utilization of CBOs

The JTPA implementation literature provides apparently contradictory perspectives on the utilization of CBOs in employment and training programs. Much of the literature stresses the continued prominence, if not dominance, of CBOs, while other studies point to sharp cutbacks that have occurred since the termination of programs funded under the CETA Public Service Employment (PSE) program and Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) and the replacement of CETA by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

Some of these differences may come from the different definitions of what constitutes a community group that were discussed in the preceding chapter, and others undoubtedly result from the fact that most studies are based on only small samples of sites that differ widely from each other.

Problems such as these make it difficult to answer such basic questions as what types of service deliverers are most often used for what purposes. All that can be said with certainty is that the answers to these kinds of questions vary considerably from site to site. Thus, Cook et al. (1985b) note:

> In several cities, CBOs deliver almost all of the classroom training, and at the other extreme, in a few SDAs, all the classroom training is provided by various levels of schools, both public and private. Usually, a mixture of CBOs, public schools of various levels, and/or for-profit schools and companies deliver the classroom training service. (p. 6-18)

The Conventional Wisdom: Severe Cutbacks

The conventional wisdom about cutbacks being experienced by CBOs can be summarized in the following excerpt from a speech by the leader of one of the nation's major national CBOs:

> The advent of the Job Training Partnership Act has not been favorable to community-based organizations serving unemployed young people. The overall decline in the amount of money available for employment and training certainly is one reason for the reduction in services, but it is not the sole reason. The transition to the new Act itself is also part of the problem. (Brown 1984, p. 25)

Much of the JTPA implementation literature supports this conclusion. A survey of several hundred JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) conducted by the National Alliance of Business

revealed that about a quarter of them planned to use fewer CBOs in the second year of the program than in the first, or to use no CBOs at all. Walker et al. (1984), Walker, Feldstein, and Solow (1985), and Nightingale (1985) report that the implementation of JTPA is resulting in a decrease in the utilization of nonprofit CBOs as subcontractors in favor of increased utilization of colleges and small businesses. Walker, Feldstein, and Solow's (1985) explanation for the decline is as follows:

> A third of the sample sites said that CBOs took another larger-than-proportional reduction in initial JTPA funding. This reduction came about in part because certain services, such as outreach and counseling often handled by CBOs, were being reduced or eliminated in order to lower administrative costs, and in part because other contractors had been substituted for CBOs.
>
> In a few cases, . . . CBOs voluntarily dropped out of providing employment and training services because they did not feel that they could meet JTPA's prescribed placement and cost standards while continuing to enroll those members of the community their institutional mission called for them to serve. (p. 28)

An Urban Institute study (Nightingale and O'Brien 1984) of the role of CBOs under JTPA reports that "CBOs are substantially less involved in JTPA than had been true under CETA" but cautions that there are many different types of CBOs and they have had different experiences since the transition to the new program:

> Two [of the six national CBOs studied], 70001 and Wider Opportunities for Women (WOW), have more local affiliates in 1984 than they did in 1980 (70001 has almost doubled its number of affiliates). Of the others, SER and the Urban League have lost only a handful of local programs. OIC, however, has 40 percent fewer local affiliates. . . . Most OIC and Urban League programs continue to receive local JTPA contracts, but typically at a much reduced level . . . SER, on the other hand, appears to be doing somewhat better than OIC and Urban League, perhaps because of its strength and concentration on selected areas of the country (e.g., where large Hispanic populations reside). (p. 21)
>
> The two women's organizations [WOW and the National Displaced Homemakers Network] both report generally less local involvement with JTPA than with CETA. In part, this may be because JTPA did not continue the specific targeting on displaced homemakers that had been included in the CETA legislation. (p. 23)
>
> There is some contrast presented by 70001. Their number of local affiliates has increased from 31 in 1981 to 59 in 1984, and the local involvement with JTPA has increased. (p. 24)

The Urban Institute report on CBOs also provides evidence of cutbacks in funding and activities by local CBOs that are not affiliated with national organizations. Urban Institute staff were unable to locate 8 of 38 CBOs selected for a survey and presume that they are out of business. Highlights of the findings of the survey for 27 CBOs appear below:

> All of the organizations have maintained their general service and client orientation. . . . However six [of the 27] organizations had operated training programs in the past but no longer do so since the termination of PSE and nationally funded youth projects. . . .

> Twenty-five of the 27 organizations contacted had some type of training contract under CETA, but only 13 currently have JTPA training contracts. Ten of the thirteen report that their JTPA training activity is greatly below what had been provided under CETA. (Nightingale and O'Brien 1984, pp. 31, 34, 43)

Finally, the report suggests that the cutbacks have not been as severe for the separately funded JTPA summer youth activities:

> There is somewhat more continued involvement under the Summer Youth Program. Twelve of the 14 CBOs that had summer youth in the past continue to be involved, usually with the same number of youth. (p. 44)

The unpublished results of a survey of over 300 CBOs conducted for the National Youth Employment Coalition (Bailis 1984c) provide stark evidence of the declines in support for CBOs that began at the end of CETA and have continued into JTPA:

> Between 1980 and 1984, the average funding for CBOs from CETA/JTPA decreased by 58%. Roughly one in four CBOs lost all CETA/JTPA funding. The average funding for CBO efforts to provide employment and training for disadvantaged youth decreased by 35%. . . . The total employment and training funds provided by JTPA represent only 42% of the funds that were received from CETA in 1980. . . .
>
> Only two-thirds of the CBOs that had gotten support from CETA are now in receipt of grants from JTPA; one out of three have fallen by the wayside. (pp. i, ii, 6)

The survey also points out that the cuts have not been random; it is the newer CBOs that were created since the advent of the War on Poverty that are feeling the brunt of the cutbacks:

> The average CBO [respondent in the survey] had approximately 95% of the [total] funding in 1984 that it had in 1980. This figure is based in part in a 50% growth in funding in the more traditional CBOs that were in existence before the War on Poverty, and a 35% decrease in total funding for the newer CBOs. (p. 8)

Emphasizing the Positive

Despite this widespread evidence of cutbacks, the literature also provides a considerable amount of evidence that CBOs remain a central element in the employment and training system for disadvantaged adults and youth. Research conducted by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) has concluded that CBOs are awarded JTPA subcontracts more frequently than any other type of contractor, accumulating 36 percent of the total contract value at its 15 sample sites, and ranging from 6 to 77 percent of contracting dollars at individual SDAs (Comptroller General of the U.S. 1985).

Similarly, a survey of 329 SDAs conducted in 1985 by the National Alliance of Business (Brady et al. 1986) reveals that more than four-fifths of the SDAs (81 percent) had contracted with at least one CBO for training or services in FY 84, and the overall use of CBOs to provide training and/or services had *increased* over the first two years of JTPA. In addition, as is illustrated in Table 1, there is evidence that at least some employment and training programs that made heavy use of CBOs in the past have continued to do so.

TABLE 1

TRAINING CONTRACTS IN SAN DIEGO SDA BY TYPE OF AGENCY

	Last Year of CETA (%)	JTPA FY 84 (%)
Community based organizations	48	45
Public education	21	22
Private education	12	10
Private employers	8	9
Local governments	9	9
Other private nonprofit (for example labor, chambers of commerce)	2	5

SOURCE: Testimony of Patrick Moore before House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, May 2, 1985

Causes of Changing Utilization of CBOs

The literature provides a wide range of explanations for the widely reported decline in utilization of CBOs under JTPA. It is noteworthy that these reasons generally do *not* include perceived ineffectiveness of CBOs in serving disadvantaged youth and adults.

Instead, as is discussed in some detail in Bailis, Van Coevering, and Morris (1979) and Bailis (1987a), cutbacks in funding for CBOs are far more likely to be associated with overall cutbacks in priorities associated with programs that CBOs have become specialists in, e.g., provision of work experience for out-of-school youth.* Other prominent reasons for cutting back on funding for CBOs have included decisions by CETA Prime Sponsors and JTPA SDAs to deliver services in-house, thereby rejecting all subcontracting practices, and concerns about the accountability and fiscal soundness of CBOs in their roles of subcontractors. In some instances, CBOs were thought (or found) to have inadequate financial and accounting systems; in others, CBOs were said to devote inadequate attention to recordkeeping. But in any event, the reasons for cutting back on funding for CBOs often had little or no connection to the community groups' abilities to reach disadvantaged youth and provide quality services to them.

*The JTPA legislation discourages funding for work experience by requiring that 50 percent of the wages paid for this activity must be applied to a limited pot of money that also must fund all program administration and participant support costs.

Finally, leaders of CBOs often argue that relatively small, nonprofit organizations such as theirs find it difficult to deal with performance-based contracting and related procurement procedures that are now becoming standard under JTPA. These commonly advanced explanations are supported by the Urban Institute study (Nightingale and O'Brien 1984) in the following manner:

> Several reasons were given for the reduced JTPA activity. First, there is simply less money than under CETA, so naturally the contract amounts are lower. Second, the shift toward increased use of JTPA performance-based contracts has hurt many CBOs unable to maintain an adequate cash flow to allow them to accept such contracts. Third, CBOs feel they are unable to compete with traditional training institutions like community colleges and vocational technical schools which have lower administrative costs. Finally, these CBOs report substantial reductions in youth training which had been a major activity under CETA. (pp. 43-44)

> This growth [in 70001 affiliates as opposed to other CBOs] is perhaps due to their willingness to accept performance-based contracts. In fact, the national organization borrowed money to help the local affiliates maintain sufficient cash flow to allow them to accept performance-based contracts. (p. 24)

These conclusions about the impact of fixed price contracting on utilization of CBOs are echoed in a 1984 Congressional oversight report:

> A number of representatives of community based organizations, as well as others, said the new emphasis on fixed-price unit contracting, in which providers are paid the agreed-upon cost of training after training is completed and participants are placed in employment, has hampered the ability of community based organizations to take part in the program. . . .
>
> Community based organizations often do not have the financial resources necessary to operate on a cost reimbursement basis. "Cash flow" becomes a serious or fatal problem for community-based agencies, according to a PIC Chairman from a western state. (U.S. Congress, 1984a, p. 10)

However, the president of a major national CBO (Brown 1984) has concluded that performance-based contracting has its pluses as well as minuses for CBOs:

> For CBOs, performance contracts are a mixed blessing. On the one hand, they offer greater flexibility with expenditures as well as the potential to accrue a modest operating surplus. On the other, they can cause immense cash flow problems, create pressure to serve the easiest-to-serve clients, and expose the CBO to irrecoverable financial loss. (p. 6)

Functions of CBOs

There are also differences of opinion in the literature on the extent to which CBOs are providing different types of services under JTPA than they did under CETA. The most comprehensive profile of CBO activities in the vocational education field can be found in a 1984 survey of more than 300 community groups conducted under the auspices of the National Youth Employment Coalition (Bailis 1984c). As is shown in Table 2, the results of the survey suggest that there has been considerable continuity in the types of services that CBOs provide:

> With the single major exception of work experience, the community-based organizations that are still in the manpower business are still providing the kinds of services that they have been best known for in the past . . .
>
> First and foremost, community based organizations are providing counseling and other supportive services to disadvantaged adults and youth. More CBOs are currently delivering these services than any others. . . . The second most frequently delivered services are job development, job placement, or job search assistance. . . .
>
> Outreach and assessment are the responsibilities that CBOs carry out the third most frequently. . . . The fourth most frequently encountered function being carried out by CBOs today [in 1984] is classroom skills training. . . . More than half of the CBOs that once provided year round work experience—for either in school or out of school youth—are no longer doing so. (Bailis 1984c, pp. 3-4)

Although the results of the study are not based on a random sample, they represent the largest sample of CBOs involved in employment and training ever surveyed, and they do make it clear that CBOs have been major providers of prevocational training in the past, and that they continue to provide it at the present time.

In conclusion, despite some evidence to the contrary*, the bulk of the available evidence suggests that the vast changes in employment and training programs over recent years have not affected the basic repertoire of the community-based organizations that are still in business. Administrators of vocational education programs who are looking for help with prevocational services on the one hand, and direct placement assistance for disadvantaged trainees on the other, are still likely to find viable resources in the CBOs in their communities.

---

*For example, Cook et al. (1984) found that the use of CBOs was declining for what had been such core services for community groups as outreach, referral, and counseling.

TABLE 2
PROPORTION OF COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING SPECIFIC SERVICES

	Provided at Some Time in 1980-84	Provided in 1984	(n)*
Job development	95%	88%	101
Counseling	92%	83%	104
Other supportive services	91%	83%	100
Job placement or job search assistance (Job Club)	90%	83%	93
Outreach	90%	73%	102
Assessment	87%	70%	99
Comprehensive (everything from intake to placement)	81%	68%	102
Classroom skills training	77%	61%	103
Summer work experience	77%	57%	97
Remedial education	75%	55%	99
Intake and eligibility determination	73%	57%	102
Vocational exploration	73%	54%	96
On-the-job training	68%	45%	103
Year-round work experience for out-of-school youth	68%	30%	98
Prevocational training	67%	52%	99
Year-round work experience for in-school youth	56%	27%	96
English as a second language	41%	30%	97

SOURCE: Bailis (1984c).
*Number of CBOs providing information on this topic.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Contributions that CBOs Can Make

As described in several places in this monograph, CBOs have provided a wide variety of vocational and prevocational services in a wide range of settings throughout the United States. Although research studies have not yet provided definitive proof of the effectiveness of CBOs—or of any other deliverer of services to the same population*—there can be little doubt that certain CBOs have provided exemplary services to disadvantaged client groups in the past, and that they have the potential to do so in the future.

Although community groups have provided a full spectrum of services to disadvantaged clients, the materials summarized in the body of this monograph and in appendix A suggest that the CBO's comparative advantages may well lie in two areas: prevocational services and job development and placement. CBOs have the potential to be effective in assisting mainstream vocational programs in their efforts to reach out to disadvantaged students who are not being adequately served in current school systems, to assess their needs, and to bring them up to an educational and motivational level that will permit them to get maximum benefit from traditional vocational education offerings. Community groups may also be useful in helping to place the graduates of traditional vocational programs because of the links that they have formed with employers in minority communities and elsewhere.

Despite these strengths, many CBOs are not in a position to provide the highest quality vocational offerings on their own. Many of them lack the financial means to provide modern training facilities and equipment that vocational schools and community colleges often provide.

The conclusion to be drawn from these facts is clear: CBOs often have services to offer public secondary and postsecondary institutions that are seeking to train disadvantaged youth and other underserved groups, and these institutions have something to offer CBOs in return. In theory, partnerships between community groups and public education agencies can provide services to disadvantaged clients that neither partner could provide on its own.

In recent years, more and more school systems have been translating this theory into reality. For example, vocational educators have initiated plans to enter into a wide variety of partnerships with local affiliates of the Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OIC/A) to do the following:

*For the shortcomings of existing research on the effectiveness of employment-oriented programs for disadvantaged youth, see Betsey, Hollister, and Papageorgiou (1985).

- Provide outreach, assessment, counseling, basic academic and functional remediation services to dropouts. (The partners include the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational Technical Education, the Oklahoma City Vocational Technical District #22, Oklahoma City Private Industry Council, and the Oklahoma City OIC.)*

- Provide for upgrading of basic skills, provide support services, and develop work maturity and functional skills for out-of-school disadvantaged youth who are then referred to a local area vocational center. (The partners include the Illinois State Office of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education, the Rockford Area Vocational Center, the Rockford Board of Education, and the OIC of Winnebago County.)

- Provide a feeder program consisting of preemployment, work maturity, and basic education skills for disadvantaged youth. (Partners include the Florida State Department of Education, Duval County School District, Florida Junior College, and the Jacksonville OIC.)

- Jointly identify, test, and refer participants, and provide GED preparation and vocational training along with a local school district (Partners include the Michigan Department of Education, the School District of the City of Saginaw, the Saginaw-Midland JTPA Administration, and the OIC of Metropolitan Saginaw.)

Other partnership efforts involving OIC affiliates focus on identifying potential dropouts and providing services to keep them in school, providing computer-assisted remedial education, and providing alternative schooling systems for young female heads of households.

Barriers to Partnerships with CBOs and Strategies to Overcome Them

Recognition of mutual benefits is necessary but not sufficient to create the kinds of productive partnerships between schools and CBOs that were envisioned by the authors of the Carl Perkins Act. In particular, even when the potential contributions that CBOs can make are identified, those who would work with these community groups still face a number of barriers. Specific CBOs in the jurisdiction must be identified and assessed to make sure that they are capable of delivering the kinds of services that are needed. Then mutually acceptable plans must be drafted and implemented.

The remainder of this section consists of a summary of the kinds of problems that have been encountered in efforts to implement Title III of the Perkins Act, and an indication of the kinds of strategies that may prove useful in overcoming them.

Delays in Implementing the Act

Some of the problems in developing partnerships with CBOs relate to the delays in getting any newly passed legislation implemented. Money has only recently become available for implementing the CBO title of the Perkins Act because of the time that it has taken to appropriate the funds

*These examples have been adapted from the *Technical Assistance Guide—Community Based Organizations, Job Training Partnership Act and Vocational Education: A Partnership Designed to Reduce Youth Unemployment*, prepared by the Opportunities Academy of Management Training, Inc. in June 1986.

and allocate them to and within states. In many cases, funds have become available to local education agencies only after budgets for the coming year have been finalized.

If past experience is any guide, these kinds of delays can be expected to be a one-time phenomenon, less of a problem in the future than they have been in the past. However, as was shown by the experience with the CETA and JTPA set-asides for vocational education, the availability of funding at the local level will not, in and of itself, guarantee that partnerships between schools and CBOs can be developed. Other barriers still remain.

Lack of Knowledge about Community Groups

In some cases, school officials at the state and local levels may be unaware of the kinds of organizations that are considered CBOs or which ones can be found in their communities. Excessively narrow conceptions of what a CBO is can be combated by reviewing the wide variety of organizations that are identified by name in the Job Training Partnership Act and thus referenced in the Perkins Act. The JTPA definition of CBOs includes such nationwide organizations as the Opportunities Industrialization Centers (OICs), National Urban League (NUL), SER-Jobs for Progress, United Way of America, Mainstream, and National Puerto Rican Forum; as well as unaffiliated neighborhood groups and organizations, vocational rehabilitation organizations, rehabilitation facilities, agencies serving youth, union-related organizations, and employer-related organizations.

The variety of organizations that are commonly described as CBOs can be illustrated by the following partial list of attendees at a 1979 Department of Labor-funded conference on the role of CBOs in youth employment programs:

- Alternative Schools Network
- Federation of Southern Cooperatives
- Future Homemakers of America
- Girls Clubs of America, Inc.
- National Community Action Agency Executive Directors Association
- National Council of Negro Women
- National Puerto Rican Forum
- National Urban League
- Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OIC)
- SER-Jobs for Progress, Inc.
- The Woodlawn Organization
- United Neighborhood Centers of America, Inc.

- United Way of America
- Watts Labor Community Action Committee
- Young Women's Christian Association of the USA

Specific information about CBOs in any locality and how to get in touch with them can often be obtained from a variety of sources. (Names and addresses of contacts can be found in appendix B.)

- The National Youth Employment Coalition and its nationwide affiliates
- The Center for Community Change
- The national headquarters of CBOs
- State and local client advocacy organizations, and
- Local private industry councils (PICs) as well as other state and local agencies funded through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)

Technical Barriers to Coordination

Funding cycles. Many CBOs have received the bulk of their funding from the JTPA program and the CETA program that preceded it. As a result, their program planning cycle is often based on the employment and training program deadlines rather than those in use in school systems.

Differences such as these can hamper efforts at planning joint efforts, but in a world of increasingly severe financial constraints on funding availability, CBOs can be expected to be more flexible about adopting a longer run planning horizon and thus take whatever steps are necessary to overcome technical problems such as these.

Differences in perspectives. Even when staff of school systems and CBOs know each other, their relationships are often hampered by differences in perspectives and a tradition of distrust and lack of understanding. Many CBOs have been created to serve as alternatives to school systems that have, in their opinion, failed to serve minorities and other disadvantaged youths and adults adequately. It is, therefore, not surprising to find them skeptical about the commitments of these mainstream institutions to devote increased attention and priority to these groups.

On the other side, vocational educators sometimes express concern that the focus on specific segments of the local population that is emphasized by CBOs will detract from their schools' broader historical mission to serve the entire community. In addition, some school officials have been reticent about accepting the advice of community group leaders who do not have formal credentials as educators.

There are no easy solutions to this type of problem. However, past experiences suggest that there is no substitute for efforts by potential partners to get to know each other and slowly build up the trust necessary to enter into productive working relationships. In some cases, school administrators and leaders of CBOs have false stereotypes of each other, and face-to-face meetings can help to overcome them. In other cases, the concerns that they have may have a basis in

fact, and true partnerships will only be possible with the kind of change in attitude that takes considerable time and effort.

Concerns about CBO accountability. Some organizations have been hesitant to enter into contracts with CBOs because of concern about the soundness of their fiscal and accounting systems. Such concerns have often had a basis in fact. In many cases, however, these concerns are unjustified, and school administrators will discover that community groups have exemplary accounting and control systems.

In other cases, it will become clear that community groups do not in fact have the kinds of accounting systems that school administrators feel are necessary. There are several kinds of strategies that can be used to overcome this situation. They include limiting contracting to CBOs that have demonstrated an ability to manage and account for funds, working with CBOs to develop suitable procedures, or using intermediary organizations or other contracting arrangements that can meet the requirements imposed by school system accounting departments.

Future Prospects

As noted at several points in this monograph, there appear to be clear benefits that can accrue to vocational educators when they enter into partnerships with community groups to serve disadvantaged youth: such partnerships can help attract those who have given up on the school system back to programs run or sponsored by the schools, and can provide disadvantaged youth and adults the basic skills that are needed to succeed in secondary and postsecondary programs. They can also help traditional vocational education programs increase their placement rates.

As is often the case, it is by no means simple to translate these ideas into functioning partnerships. Potential partners have to get to know each other and develop working relationships based on mutual trust and mutual ability to deliver. Initial steps can involve potential partners learning about each other's organizations, and the leaders of the potential partners getting to know each other personally. Educators can learn about community groups' track records from organizations that have funded them in the past such as the JTPA Service Delivery Area. Initial steps that can lead to partnerships also include:

- visits to CBO facilities, and meetings with CBO staff and board members,
- nonfinancial agreements to promote referrals and other means of coordination such as shared space, and
- joint development of proposals for new funding

To paraphrase a famous Chinese expression, the path to partnerships may be treacherous, but must begin with a series of small steps.

It is still too early to determine how successful the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act has been in promoting partnerships between vocational educators in public school systems and community groups, but several conclusions seem clear. The framework for closer cooperation has been put in place, and unlike many efforts at promoting partnerships, funding is available to support new initiatives throughout the country. Monographs such as this one should help schools and CBOs recognize their mutual interests and work together in translating them into programs that improve access to quality vocational education among many previously underserved groups.

APPENDIX A

Exemplary Program Models

This appendix has been prepared to illustrate the range of expertise that community groups have and can bring to partnerships with public vocational education agencies. It contains specific examples of active CBO involvement in the planning and delivery of prevocational or vocational education services, identified from the research literature, annual reports and other publications of national community-based organizations, and descriptive materials sent to the author in response to an invitation transmitted by the leadership of the National Youth Employment Coalition.

None of the examples presented in this appendix have been proven to be effective in rigorous experimental settings with randomized control groups. However, all appear to have been effective based on materials supplied by the organizations that are described.

As is illustrated in the specific examples presented in this appendix, CBOs are perhaps best known for "soft services" such as counseling or assessment, but they have developed and implemented a wide range of curricula that help young Americans obtain the prevocational and vocational skills needed to succeed in an ever-changing labor market.

Vocational Orientation and Counseling

Community groups are often said to be at their best in efforts to reach and communicate with hard-to-serve groups. The following example of a well regarded program serving youth that become involved in the court system illustrates how CBOs can excel in carrying out this function.

Youth Opportunities Unlimited—St. Louis County Juvenile Court Educational-Vocational Program*

The organization. The St. Louis County (Missouri) Juvenile Court has the responsibility of rehabilitating youngsters between 12 and 18 years of age. According to a brochure issued by the court, its Educational Vocational Programs are designed to give educational assistance to students who have not performed well in traditional settings. The ultimate goal of the Programs, however, is to return the student to the "real world," equipped to succeed.

The program. The Youth Opportunities Unlimited (Y.O.U.) is a 1-year vocational orientation and counseling program serving juvenile court involved youth who have dropped out of school. Nearly 80 percent have below age-appropriate academic skills.

Students enrolled in Y.O.U. are assigned to a vocational counselor for one year. The program also includes an intensive 3-week group orientation conducted by two counselors. After the orientation session, counselors contact participating youth at least once a month to check on progress toward achieving vocational goals as well as to assist them in procuring student loans, gaining admission to a technical school or junior college, and in entering the vocational rehabilitation system and/or full-time employment.

Nearly all Y.O.U. youth also participate in the General Educational Development (GED) program, which has been designed to accommodate students with academic skills as low as beginning junior high levels. (Students with less than a junior high educational level for whom a GED is a realistic goal receive remedial education to raise them to the entry junior high school level.)

---

*The information in this section has been adapted from materials supplied by the St. Louis County Juvenile Court. Information contacts for this program are listed in appendix B.

The program has been recognized by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges as a "unique and innovative" youth program. More than 90 percent of its participants are placed into training, education, or job settings.

Remedial Education

Many of those who supported the Title IIA funding within the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 hoped that CBOs would be able to reach dropouts and provide the remedial education necessary for them to benefit from more traditional vocational education offerings. The following example illustrates how a CBO implemented a remedial education program that draws upon effective curriculum and teaching techniques.

A Competency-based GED Curriculum— Jobs for Youth*

The organization. Jobs for Youth (JFY) is a nonprofit employment program in Boston, New York, and Chicago that serves 16- to 21-year-old high school dropouts. The Massachusetts JFY affiliate provides the following profile of its clientele:

- Most belong to minority groups
- Over half are teenage parents
- All are unemployed and economically disadvantaged
- One quarter have some court involvement

The JFY general approach involves combining work with education, providing young people with competency-based skills, daily living, and job-related skills through a combination of diagnostic prescriptive education, counseling, and employer services.

The program. As defined by JFY, competency-based education includes:

- a set of written, measurable objectives,
- a variety of learning activities and instructional activities,
- performance-based assessments,
- pre- and post-assessments for each curriculum unit (competency),
- no grades and no failures,
- individually paced instruction,
- open-entry, open-exit program structure,

*The information in this section has been adapted from materials provided by Jobs for Youth. Information contacts for this organization are listed in appendix B.

- learner involvement in defining what, when, and how to learn.

In implementing this approach, JFY has chosen to employ the following:

- Commercially available pre- and post-assessments
- Commercially available and JFY-developed instructional materials
- Recommended and alternative instructional materials tied to each objective
- Complete learner access to all tests, recommended instructional materials, activity answer keys, recommended lesson plans, and procedures for using them
- Simple, clear records

The approach was field tested in 1984 and revised to overcome problems; it is now in regular use.

Career Education in an Alternative High School Setting

At times, community groups have attempted to integrate basic elements of vocational education curricula into their own broader approaches to serving disadvantaged youth and adults. The following example describes one of the most ambitious and most carefully evaluated of such efforts. It is not currently funded, but the results of this project could be useful in shaping similar efforts in other settings.

The Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America Career Intern Program (CIP)

The organization.* The Opportunities Industrialization Centers (OIC) of America represent one of the largest nationwide networks of CBOs in the employment and training field. Created in 1964 by a black Baptist minister, the program grew rapidly and within a decade included more than 100 affiliates that had served nearly a quarter of a million trainees. Anderson (1976) described the rather unique ethnic identity of OICs of America in the following way:

> Although the organization has a racially integrated staff and served a multi-racial clientele, OIC is still considered a "black" organization because . . . it is staffed largely by black professionals; it is most often located in predominantly black neighborhoods; and over time it has drawn upward of 85 to 90 percent of its enrollees from the black community. . . . Racial and ethnic diversity characterizes an increasing number of OIC centers, but there is little doubt today that OIC is cast deeply with a black identity. (p. 1)

The program. The Career Intern Program (CIP) model was targeted to 10th through 12th graders who were dropouts or potential dropouts and included three components in an alternative high school setting: career awareness, career exploration, and career specialization. The 1972 pilot program in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, was developed through a cooperative effort of OICs of

*This description of OICs of America and the CIP program is based upon several sources including Anderson (1976) and the OIC publication **Career Intern Program—A Decade of Achievement: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow** (undated and unpaginated). Further information about OIC can be obtained at the address listed in appendix B.

America and the city Board of Education, with support from the National Institute of Education and the U.S. Office of Education. Based upon extensive evaluation and feedback, the model was later replicated in four additional sites.

CIP course requirements and credit awarding procedures were designed to meet local educational standards; CIP staff members met the certification requirements of the local school system. According to OIC

> CIP becomes semi-autonomous, observing the procedures of the local school system but providing an alternative educational experience and setting for students. Each CIP cultivates a close working relationship with its local school system.
>
> It is not a rival, but rather a specialist and ally to the school system, educating disadvantaged youth.
>
> Interns maintain their association with their "parent" school and can participate in athletic and extracurricular programs. Upon graduation, they receive diplomas from that school. The strong cooperative bond between CIP and the local school system gives interns a mix which furthers their educational, personal, and career goals.

Employment and Work Experience Programs

Much of the CETA research literature suggests that disadvantaged youth and others who are not familiar with the job market can often benefit from structured work experience and employment programs that can convey the expectations that employers will be holding, and then move on to other forms of vocational education or employment and training programs. The following example shows how one community adapted a statewide model to run such a program within its more urban environs.

The San Francisco Conservation Corps*

The Organization. The San Francisco Conservation Corps currently operates as a private nonprofit corporation governed by a 12-person board of directors appointed by the mayor of the city. Board members represent business, labor, civic, education, and land management agencies. Operations are handled by a 15-member staff. Funding for the Corps comes from federal Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), state funds from the California Conservation Corps, foundation and corporate contributions, and private contracts.

The program. The San Francisco Conservation Corps operates as a year-round, nonresidential employment and training program for out-of-school youth between the ages of 18 and 23. It represents an adaptation of the California Conservation Corps model to an urban and nonresidential setting.

Corps members do physical work 4 days a week in crews under close adult supervision earning $3.35 an hour. The program also includes a mandatory 5th day a week of unpaid youth development activities. An average of 65 to 85 youth were employed in seven work crews at any given time in 1985. The Corps also includes an 8-week summer program for 16- to 21-year-olds.

*The information in this section has been adapted from the annual report of the San Francisco Conservation Corps, and a draft interim report on the project prepared by Public/Private Ventures. Information contacts for the Corps are listed in appendix B.

Combined/Comprehensive Programs

Staff of community groups have often argued that the problems faced by their disadvantaged clients are complex and can be addressed only through multidimensional, comprehensive approaches. Several examples of multicomponent or comprehensive programs offered by CBOs are summarized as follows.

The Work Readiness Program—
The Children's Aid Society*

The organization. The Children's Aid Society is a social service agency that has provided assistance to needy families and children in New York City for over 133 years. Its programs include neighborhood centers, summer camps, health and education programs, and services to the homeless.

The program. The Work Readiness Program provides a 3-year sequence of comprehensive services for youth between the ages of 13 and 18, including educational remediation, counseling, and job development. Its curriculum has been designed to help teenagers develop the kinds of work habits and attitudes that will promote positive work experiences. The curriculum includes:

- Educational testing and assessment
- Individual tutoring to improve academic performance
- Group educational experiences that promote students' abilities to solve problems and make decisions
- Group and individual counseling to encourage students to examine their attitudes about work
- Meetings with successful employees from backgrounds that may be similar as well as different
- Opportunities to expand job and career choices.

The program currently receives no public funding and is operated out of neighborhood centers in central Harlem, East Harlem, and the Upper West Side and Yorkville neighborhoods of Manhattan.

The Boys Club Work Experience Program—
Milwaukee Boys and Girls Club**

The Organization. The Boys Clubs of America was founded in 1906 and is a congressionally chartered federation of more than 1,000 local clubs serving the social and health needs of over 1,250,000 youth between the ages of 7 and 17. The Seher Unit of the Milwaukee Boys and Girls

*The information in this section has been adapted from materials supplied by the Children's Aid Society. An information contact for this group is listed in appendix B.

**The information in this section has been adapted from material provided by the Boys Clubs of America. Further information about the program can be obtained from the information contact listed in appendix B.

Club has a total membership of approximately 2,500, of which 33 percent are in the 14-17 age bracket to which program eligibility is limited.

The program. Despite its name, the Boys Club Work Experience program has two major components: 10 weeks of part-time employment at the club for about 12 hours a week at minimum wage, and a world-of-work training program that includes 10 one-hour sessions that are mandatory but do not involve any pay.

This is a first-time work experience program; youth with previous work experience are not permitted to participate. Program entrants are required to have a grade point average of C and to maintain this average throughout the participation period.

The world of work curriculum is based upon two publications from Boys Clubs of America, *Building Employment Skills Today* and *World of Work Curriculum*, and a program model developed by the Boys' Town Career Development Program. Outside speakers include guidance counselors, bankers, personnel officers of local firms, and social workers.

The 70001 Model—The 70001 Network of Local Programs*

The organization. 70001 is a national, nonprofit corporation that provides high school dropouts with a comprehensive variety of services. It began as a pilot program, funded by Thom McAn Shoe Company, to combat the social and economic problems faced by high school dropouts. In 16 years, it has grown into a national network of more than 50 programs in 20 states.

The program. The 70001 program model includes three parts: (1) educational services such as preparation for General Education Development (GED) tests and remedial education, (2) employment services such as training in interview skills and work habits, and (3) motivational activities that stress teamwork, helping others, and recognition of successes.

Four of the local programs have instituted a comprehensive competencies program that provides a self-directed and self-paced program using computers, audiovisual materials, and printed materials. A scholarly program for participants who want to attend college or vocational school is supported entirely through private corporate contributions.

The employment services stress acquisition of job-finding skills such as interviewing and oral communications as well as good work habits through a 3-to 5-week program based on a competency-based Job Readiness Curriculum. In areas where employers document a specific occupational need, 70001 combines its general employment services with specific skills training in such areas as retailing, banking, hospitality, and electronics. In all cases, 70001 staff maintain close contact with participants after they obtain jobs in order to continue to provide guidance, counseling, and support.

---

*The information in this section has been adapted from *Investing in Opportunity: The 1985 70001 Annual Report*. Further information about the program and its local affiliates can be obtained from the information contact listed in appendix B.

The Seventy-Thousand One Career Association (SEVCA) is an organization created by 70001 to reinforce good attitudes toward life and work, using such techniques as life skills activities and career seminars given by local business leaders.

The OIC Comprehensive Services Model*

The organization. OICs of America were described earlier in this appendix.

The program. From their inception more than 20 years ago, the local affiliates of OICs of America have attempted to serve the "whole person" that enrolls in their programs. For this reason, OICs prefers to supplement skills training with a range of services including outreach and recruitment, often carried out one-to-one with prospective trainees; assessment and counseling that stress subjective assessments and objective techniques such as work sample testing; and prevocational ("feeder") training that is aimed at trainee motivation and attitudinal development as well as basic education skills, GED, and English as a second language. Minority awareness courses often play a central role in the comprehensive curricula developed by OICs. Unlike many other organizations in the MDTA/CETA era, OICs generally frowned upon payment of trainee stipends, thereby setting themselves up to serve those who were attracted by the prospect of training, not those who were hoping for monetary assistance.

Other Innovative Approaches

Advocates of CBOs often stress the flexibility that comes with being free from the larger bureaucratic structures within which most public education programs must perform. The following examples illustrate the kinds of programming that CBOs have engaged in as a result of this flexibility.

Promotion of Entrepreneurship—Jobs for Youth

The organization. Jobs for Youth was described earlier in this appendix.

The program. The JFY Youth Business Initiative provides business training, capital and technical assistance to eligible Boston youth (between the ages of 18 and 25) who want to start their own businesses, have specific ideas for businesses, and need financial assistance. The program consists of the following elements:

- A 35-hour seminar series that touches on such topics as marketing, business recordkeeping, cash flow, and preparing a business plan
- Development of a business plan
- Provision of start-up loans and assistance in obtaining commercial loans for those with approved business plans, and
- One year of technical assistance from two mentors: a specialist in financial and general business matters, and a specialist in the specific line of business.

*Material in this section has been adapted from Anderson (1976).

Partnerships of Community Groups, Foundations, Educators, and/or Business—Foundation Collaborative Summer Youth Employment Career/Vocational Exploration Programs*

The organization. The Foundation Collaborative Summer Youth Employment Career/Vocational Exploration Program is funded by 27 Philadelphia area foundations and corporations and has made grants in excess of $1.4 million annually to 16 government and community agencies in five counties in Pennsylvania and one in New Jersey. Participating community agencies have included Aspira, Inc., Greater Philadelphia Federation of Settlements, Hartraft Community Corporation, Philadelphia Urban Coalition, South Lehigh Action Council, Camden County Council on Economic Opportunity, and the Community Action Agency of Delaware County, the Boys & Girls Club of Metropolitan Philadelphia, the Metropolitan Christian Council, the Montgomery County Opportunity Board, the Allegheny West Foundation, and the Crime Prevention Association. The William Penn Foundation had the lead responsibility for administering, monitoring, and evaluating the program.

The program. The program has two components: (1) 6-week, 20-hour-a-week placements in private sector, career-oriented summer jobs for in-school disadvantaged youth, and (2) 8-week, 35-hour-a-week jobs for college students to monitor the youth and perform related administrative tasks. In 1986, 2,910 high school youth were placed, and 252 college students were hired to monitor their performance. Orientation sessions were held for participating high school youth, college monitors, and employers.

The program also included a career exploration option that addressed the interests of 24 girls with interests in nontraditional jobs for women, particularly in the construction trades. The option, called Girl Renovators in Training (GRIT), involved several intensive training sessions, followed by 9 weeks of on-site work at 12 hours a week. Worksite supervisors were women who served also as role models.

The program has been judged successful along several criteria, including the facts that more than half of all youth placed in jobs received extra hours at the employers' expenses and roughly a third were hired by their employers to full or part-time positions after the program was over.

---

*Information in this section has been adapted from the October 31, 1985 final report on this project prepared by the William Penn Foundation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. An information contact on this project is listed in appendix B.

APPENDIX B

Sources of Information about Specific Community-Based Organizations

(1) The National Youth Employment Coalition, an umbrella organization of more than 40 youth serving agencies

Contact: Don Mathis, Executive Director
National Youth Employment Coalition
1501 Broadway, Room 1111
New York, NY 10036
(212) 840-1801

(2) The Center for Community Change, a clearinghouse for information about unaffiliated community groups

Contact: Andy Mott, Vice President
Center for Community Change
1000 Wisconsin Avenue
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 342-0594

(3) Headquarters for National Community-Based Organizations

National Urban League
Equal Opportunity Building
500 East 62nd Street
New York, NY 10021
(212) 644-6500

OICs of America
100 West Coulter Street
Philadelphia, PA 19144
(215) 849-3010

SER-Jobs for Progress
1355 River Bend Drive, Suite 401
Dallas, TX 75247
(214) 631-3999

70001 Training and Employment Institute
600 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
West Wing, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20024

(4) Information contacts for additional projects cited in exemplary program models

St. Louis County Juvenile Court
Angela Neti Mueller, Coordinator
of the Educational-Vocational Program
Dave Gocken, Y.O.U. Counselor
501 South Brentwood Boulevard
Clayton, MO 63105
(314) 889-2968

Jobs for Youth
Gary M. Kaplan, Executive Director
Jobs for Youth-Boston, Inc.
312 Stuart Street, 3rd Floor
Boston, MA 02116
(617) 338-0815

San Francisco Conservation Corps
Robert Burkhardt, Executive Director
Building 111, Fort Mason
San Francisco, CA 94123
(415) 928-7322

Children's Aid Society
Sema Brainin, Ed.D.
Director, Work Readiness Program
105 East 22nd Street
New York, NY 10010
(212) 949-4631

Boys Club of America
Chris M. Protz
Irving J. Seher Unit
Milwaukee Boys and Girls Club
2404 Rogers Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

William Penn Foundation
C. Richard Cox, Senior Program Officer
1630 Locust Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 732-5114

REFERENCES

Anderson, Bernard E. *The Opportunities Industrialization Centers: A Decade of Community-Based Manpower Services*. Philadelphia: Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1976.

Bailis, Lawrence Neil. "Private Sector Initiatives: Vegematic of the 1980s?" *New England Journal of Human Resources* 4, no. 2 (Spring 1984a).

Bailis, Lawrence Neil. *Study of the Status of FY83 CETA Coordination and Program Activities—Final Report: Activities Study*. Washington, DC: National Commission for Employment Policy, June 1984b.

Bailis, Lawrence Neil. "What's Happening to CBOs under JTPA and Where Do We Go From Here?—Highlights from the NYEC Survey." Paper prepared for the National Youth Employment Coalition Symposium on Training Disadvantaged Youth—The Future Role of Community-Based Organizations, New York, NY, June 5, 1984c. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 249 343).

Bailis, Lawrence Neil. *Review Essay: Summary of the JTPA Research Literature Pertaining to SDA Activities and Coordination*. Washington, DC: National Commission for Employment Policy, 1987a.

Bailis, Lawrence Neil. *Study of the Status of PY 1985 JTPA Coordination and PY 1984 JTPA Program Activities—Final Report: Activities Study*. Washington, DC: National Commission for Employment Policy, 1987b.

Bailis, Lawrence Neil; Van Coevering, Pamela; and Morris, Lynda. *The Role of Community Based Organizations under CETA*. Cambridge, MA: Urban Systems Research & Engineering, 1979.

Betsey, Charles L.; Hollister, Robin G., Jr.; and Papageorgiou, Mary R., eds. *Youth Employment and Training Programs. The YEDPA Years*. Washington, DC: Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, 1985. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 245).

Brady, Elaine. *What's Happening with JTPA? A Complete Analysis of NAB's Survey Data*. Washington, DC: National Alliance of Business, 1985. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 255 689).

Brady, Elaine, et al. *Is the Job Training Partnership Act Working? The NAB Survey of PIC Chairs and SDA Administrators*. Washington, DC: National Alliance of Business, 1986.

Brown, Larry. "Community-based Organizations: The Challenges of the Training Partnership Act." Paper prepared for the National Youth Employment Coalition Symposium on Training Disadvantaged Youth—The Future Role of Community-Based Organizations, New York, NY, June 5, 1984. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 249 345).

Campbell-Thrane, Lucille, and Jahnke, Jessica Jo. *Building Partnerships: CBOs...CETA...Voc Ed.—Research and Development Series no. 209*. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 200 821).

Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act. Public Law 98-524. Washington, DC: U.S. Congress, 1984. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 926).

Comptroller General of the United States. *Job Training Partnership Act: Analysis of Support Cost Limits and Participant Characteristics*. Washington, DC: General Accounting Office, 1985. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 329).

Contemporary Research, Inc. *Assessment of Ethnic Minority Student Needs in Vocational Education*. Los Angeles, CA: Contemporary Research, Inc., 1974.

Cook, R.; Beatty, R. L.; Hunt, H. A.; Liebschutz, S.; MacLachlan, G. E.; MacLachlan, B.; MacManus, S. A.; Morlock, M.; Palmer, K.; Pattakos, A.; Rawlins, V. L.; Rupp, K.; Turnage, W.; and associates. *Implementation the Job Training Partnership Act: Final Report*. Rockville, MD: Westat, 1985a.

Cook, R.; Fisher, C. J.; Hunt, H. A.; Liebschutz, S.; MacLachlan, G.; MacManus, S. A.; Morlock, M.; Palmer, K.; Pattakos, A.; Rawlins, V. L.; Rupp, K.; Turnage, W.; and associates. *Transition Year Implementation Job Training Partnership Act*. Rockville, MD: Westat, 1985b.

Cook, Robert; Reesman, Cilla J.; Rupp, Kalman; Turnage, Wayne; and associates. *Early Service Delivery Area Implementation of the Job Training Act*. Rockville, MD: Westat, 1984.

Hahn, Andrew, and Lerman, Robert. *What Works in Youth Employment Policy?* Washington, DC: Committee on New American Realities, National Planning Association, March 1985.

Hahn, Andrew; Lerman, Robert; Sum, Andrew; Bailis, Larry; Friedman, Barry; Forcier, Michael; Hayes, Richard; Nelson, Valery; and Werner, Alan. *Youth Employment Record: Representative Findings on the Effectiveness of Federal Strategies for Assisting Disadvantaged Youth*. Waltham, MA: Center for Employment and Income Studies, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University, Summer 1983. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 241 619).

Hallman, Howard W. *Community-based Employment Programs*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

Lydecker, Toni H. *Job Training and the Schools: A Community Guide to Vocational Education*. Washington, DC: National Urban Coalition, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 190 782).

Mertens, Donna; McElwain, Douglas; Garcia, Gonzalo; and Whitmore, Mark. *The Effects of Participating in Vocational Education: Summary of Studies Reported Since 1968*. Research and Development Series no. 202. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, May 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 199 435).

National Council on Employment Policy. *A Vocational Education Policy for 1980s*. Washington, DC: NCEP, 1982.

Nightingale, Demetra Smith. *Federal Employment and Training Policy during the Reagan Administration: State and Local Responses*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1985.

Nightingale, Demetra Smith, and O'Brien, Carolyn Taylor. *Organizations in the Job Training Partnership System*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1984.

Opportunities Academy of Management Training, Inc. *Technical Guide—Community Based Organizations, Job Training Partnership Act and Vocational Education: A Partnership Designed to Reduce Youth Unemployment*. Philadelphia: Opportunities Academy of Management Training, Inc., 1986.

Poulard, Othello W. *The Expanding Role of Community-based Organizations: Implications for Vocational Education. Occasional Paper no. 90*. Columbus: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1983. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 227 259).

U.S. Congress. *Preliminary Oversight on the Job Training Partnership Act*. Senate Report 98-264. Washington, DC: Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity, Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Congress, December 1984a.

U.S. Congress. *Vocational-Technical Amendments of 1984*. House Report 98-612. Washington, DC: Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, 1984b. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 245 114).

The Vocational Education Study: The Final Report. Vocational Education Publication no. 8. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education, National Institute of Education, September 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 831).

Walker, Gary; Bailey, Tom; Solow, Katherine; and Shapiro, Harvey. *An Independent Sector Assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act—Final Report*. New York: Grinker-Walker and Associates, August 1986.

Walker, Gary; Feldstein, Hilary; and Solow, Katherine. *An Independent Assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act—Phase II: The Initial Implementation*. New York: Grinker-Walker and Associates, January 1985.

Walker, Gary; Grinker, William; Seessel, Thomas; Smith, R. C.; and Camer, Vince. *An Independent Sector Assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act—Phase I: The Initial Transition*. New York: Grinker-Walker and Associates, March 1984.